



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 24, 2017

Ms. M. Ann Montgomery-Moran
Assistant County & District Attorney
Ellis County
109 South Jackson
Waxahachie, Texas 75165

OR2017-06105

Dear Ms. Montgomery-Moran:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 650347.

The County of Ellis (the "county") received a request for eight categories of information pertaining to two named individuals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note a portion of the request requires the county to answer questions. The Act does not require a governmental body to answer general questions, perform legal research, or create new information in response to a request for information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990). However, the Act does require the governmental body to make a good faith effort to relate a request to information that the governmental body holds or to which it has access. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 563 at 8, 561 at 8-9 (1990), 555 at 1-2, 534 at 2-3 (1989). In this instance, we assume the county has made a good faith effort to locate any information responsive to this request. Accordingly, we will address your claimed exceptions for the submitted information.

¹Although you do not raise section 552.111 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise this section based on the substance of your arguments.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The information at issue consists of portions of a completed investigation that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The county must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* We understand you seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under the attorney work product privilege encompassed by section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, section 552.111 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver.) Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Further, as section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider your arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.102 for the information subject to section 552.022. Additionally, we will consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 9-10. Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate (1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204. The second part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You contend some of the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code contains attorney core work product that is protected by rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusion, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative that were created for trial or in anticipation of litigation. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under rule 192.5.

We next address your assertion of the attorney work product privilege for the information that is not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]" *See* Gov't Code § 552.111. This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *See City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); ORD 677 at 4-8. As noted above, rule 192.5 defines work product and a governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a); ORD 677 at 6-8. The test for determining whether information was created or developed in anticipation of litigation is the same as that discussed above concerning rule 192.5. *See Nat'l Tank Co.*, 851 S.W.2d at 207.

Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes material prepared, impressions developed, or a communication made in anticipation of litigation by or for the county. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1).

Accordingly, the county may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the work-product privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the county may not withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the county may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

In summary, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The county must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHT/bw

Ref: ID# 650347

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)